Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUN 26 1986
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

No. 85-1998

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM 1986

WILLIAM B. TABLER AND
DOVER ELEVATOR COMPANY,
PETITIONERS

v.

MARY L. WALLACE, ET AL.
RESPONDENT

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE KENTUCKY SUPREME COURT

Hon. Peter Perlman
PETER PERLMAN LAW OFFICES, P.S.C.
388 South Broadway
Lexington, Kentucky 40508
Counsel of Record for Respondent

81 pp

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether the Kentucky Supreme Court is the final interpreter of Kentucky judicial procedure, when no fundamental right is affected and no guarantee of the United States Constitution is violated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Statement	1
The Petition Should Be Denied	3
The Fourteenth Amendment Guarantee of Due Process Has Not Been Violated	5
Conclusion	6
Appendix A	1a-29a
Appendix B	30a-38a
Appendix C	39a-43a
Appendix D	44a-56a
Appendix E	57a-59a
Appendix F	60a-62a
Appendix G	63a-65a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES: Page

Dohany v. *Rogers*, 281 U.S. 362 (1930) 5

Hardware Dealers Mutual Fire Ins. Co. v. *Glidden Co.*, 284 U.S. 151 (1931) 5

Mitchell v. *W. T. Grant Co.*, 416 U.S. 600 (1974) 5

Patterson v. *New York*, 432 U.S. 197 (1977) 5

Pittsburgh & Midway Coal Mining Co. v. *Rushing*, 456 S.W.2d 816 (Ky. 1969) 4

Rash v. *Louisville & Jefferson Co. Metro Sewer District*, 309 Ky. 442, 217 S.W.2d 232 (1949) 3

United States v. *Raines*, 362 U.S. 17 (1960) 4

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS:

Kentucky Constitution, § 59 2

STATUTES & RULES:

Ky. Rev. Stat. 413.135 ..... 2, 3

Ky. Rev. Stat. 418.070 4

Ky. Civ. R. 24.03 4

Ky. Civ. R. 46 3

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM 1986

WILLIAM B. TABLER AND
DOVER ELEVATOR COMPANY,
PETITIONERS

v.

MARY L. WALLACE, ET AL.
RESPONDENT

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE KENTUCKY SUPREME COURT

The Respondent, Mary L. Wallace, as Administratrix of the Estate of William Wallace and individually, respectfully responds by Brief in Opposition to the Petitition of William B. Tabler and Dover Elevator Company for Writ of Certiorari to the Kentucky Supreme Court.

STATEMENT

On January 19, 1981, Respondent Mary Wallace initiated a cause of action for the wrongful death of her husband, William Wallace, against the Petitioners, William B. Tabler and Dover Elevator Company. On

January 30, 1983, Summary Judgment was entered in favor of the Petitioners based on the statute of limitations embodied in Ky. Rev. Stat. 413.135. App. 57a. On appeal, the Kentucky Court of Appeals reversed the Judgment of the trial court and held Ky. Rev. Stat. 413.135 to be unconstitutional under Section 59 of the Kentucky Constitution which prohibits "Local and Special Legislation.*" App. 44a. On November 21, 1985, the Supreme Court of Kentucky affirmed the holding of the Kentucky Court of Appeals and remanded the Respondent's cause of action to the trial court for further proceedings. App. 1a.

Throughout the proceedings in the Kentucky appellate courts, the Petitioners alleged that the Respondent had not preserved the issue of whether Ky. Rev. Stat. 413.135 violated the Kentucky Constitution. The issue was raised in both appellate briefs and upon oral argument. Most recently, the Kentucky Supreme Court denied the Petitioners' Petition for Rehearing, which was based solely on the issue of preservation. App. 39a. The Petitioners have been heard repeatedly on this issue and have not suffered from any lack of process.

---

*The opinion of the Kentucky Supreme Court describes § 59 of the Kentucky Constitution as being similar to, but narrower than, the Equal Protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. App. 8a.

THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED

The Respondent reaffirms the position taken in her response to Petitioners' Petition for Rehearing to the Kentucky Supreme Court that the Constitutionality of Ky. Rev. Stat. 413.135 was properly raised and preserved at the trial court level. App. 30a.

In alleging that the Respondent failed to properly preserve the issue of the constitutionality of Ky. Rev. Stat. 413.135, the Petitioners rely upon Kentucky Civil Rule 46 and Kentucky decisional law. However, the Petitioners fail to report two judicially-recognized exceptions to these authorities. Kentucky's highest court, as the final interpreter of state legislative acts with reference to the Kentucky Constitution, may waive a lack of preservation of error when the constitutionality of an act is in question. *Rash* v. *Louisville & Jefferson Co. Metro. Sewer District,* 309 Ky. 442, 217 S.W.2d 232 (1949). In *Rash,* Kentucky's highest court stated:

> . . . [W]e are of opinion that they [Kentucky Revised Statute 76.030(5); 76.060] violate other provisions of the Constitution. These grounds have not been raised by counsel. But having final authority to determine the constitutional validity of legislative acts, we are impelled by this responsibility to examine the Act for ourselves before declaring it valid.

Rash, supra, at 235.

In addition, Kentucky's highest court has stated that where it is necessary to avert manifest injustice, it will entertain an argument not first presented to the trial court. *Pittsburgh & Midway Coal Mining Co.* v. *Rushing,* 456 S.W.2d 816 (Ky. 1969). Similarly, this Court has stated that rules of practice, which limit judicial determination of constitutional issues, fall short of the status of principles ordained by the Constitution and may be subject to exceptions where there are weighty countervailing policies. *United States* v. *Raines,* 362 U.S. 17 (1960).

The Petitioners also allege a failure to comply with Ky. Rev. Stat. 418.070 and Kentucky Civil Rule 24.03 which require the timely notification of the Kentucky Attorney General when the constitutionality of a Kentucky statute is in issue. The Attorney General notified all interested parties of his intent not to intervene on October 25, 1983. App. 60a. The Attorney General's decision not to intervene rendered the Petitioners' argument moot and without merit. In addition, the Petitioners have no standing to raise this issue. The Kentucky statutory scheme regarding notification of the Attorney General is not a right which inures to the benefit of the Petitioners. The Petitioners had no right to rely upon the Attorney General's intervention, and when he did not intervene, the Petitioners certainly suffered no lack of due process.

THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT GUARANTEE OF DUE PROCESS HAS NOT BEEN VIOLATED.

In a wide variety of civil and criminal cases, this Court has consistently held that the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States does not control mere forms of procedure in state courts or regulate practice therein. *See Patterson* v. *New York*, 432 U.S. 197 (1977); *Mitchell* v. *W. T. Grant Co.*, 416 U.S. 600 (1974); *Hardware Dealers Mutual Fire Ins. Co.* v. *Glidden Co.*, 284 U.S. 151 (1931); *Dohany* v. *Rogers*, 281 U.S. 362 (1930). Further, the procedure by which rights may be enforced and wrongs remedied is peculiarly a subject of state regulation and control. *Hardware Dealers, supra*. Traditionally, the requirements of the due process clause are satisfied if one has reasonable notice and an opportunity to be heard. *Dohany, supra*. Similarly, a state may regulate the procedure of its courts in accordance with its own conception of policy and fairness unless it offends some principle of liberty or justice ranked as fundamental, such as the requirements of notice and hearing. *Patterson, supra*. The errors complained of by the Petitioners are purely procedural in nature and are insufficient to raise a federal question under the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

The Petitioners' argument that the Kentucky Supreme Court failed to decide the issue of preservation is meritless. The Petitioners have not shown how

they would be prejudiced by simply having to defend the Respondent's wrongful death action on the merits, without the shield of a statute which has been declared unconstitutional. The interpretation of procedural due process sought by the Petitioners would deprive the Respondent of her right to substantive due process.

CONCLUSION

The Petition for Writ of Certiorari fails to show the existence of a federal question. Wherefore, Respondent respectfully requests that the petition be denied.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peter Perlman
PETER PERLMAN LAW OFFICES, P.S.C.
388 South Broadway
Lexington, Kentucky 40508

Counsel of Record for Respondent

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

RENDERED: November 21, 1985
TO BE PUBLISHED

SUPREME COURT OF KENTUCKY

84-SC-844-DG
85-SC-63-TRG

WILLIAM B. TABLER, ARCHITECT
and DOVER ELEVATOR COMPANY MOVANTS

ON REVIEW FROM COURT OF APPEALS

V. #83-CA-2160-MR

(Fayette Circuit Court #81-CI-1066)

MARY L. WALLACE, ADMINISTRATRIX
OF THE ESTATE OF WILLIAM WALLACE,
and MARY L. WALLACE,
INDIVIDUALLY RESPONDENTS

AND

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY,
ARKWRIGHT-BOSTON MANUFACTURERS,
MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY, and
INDUSTRIAL RISK INSURERS APPELLANTS

APPEAL FROM JEFFERSON CIRCUIT COURT

V. HON. BENJAMIN F. SHOBE, JUDGE
NO. 79-CI-01275

NUCOR CORPORATION,
HARMAN & CONWAY, INC.,
JACOB A. HARMAN, POLK
CONWAY, and GARST-RECEVEUR
CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, INC. APPELLEES

OPINION OF THE COURT BY JUSTICE LEIBSON

AFFIRMING IN PART/REVERSING IN PART

In these two consolidated cases[1] we again take up the issue of the constitutionality of KRS 413.135, the "no action" statute which provides those persons engaged in the "design, planning, supervision, inspection or construction of any improvement to real property" with immunity from suit for damages or injury caused by any deficiency after the expiration of five years following the substantial completion of such improvement.

In the first case, *Tabler* v. *Wallace,* a maintenance man sustained fatal injury while servicing an elevator in the Harley Hotel in Lexington, Kentucky. He was crushed between the top of the elevator and the roof of the elevator shaft. The Estate's complaint charges that the overall design of the elevator and shaft was negligent and unreasonably dangerous because the clearance between the two was deficient and inadequate in terms of industry codes and safety standards. The Estate sued Dover Elevator Company, whose predecessor sold and installed the elevator and designed the shaft, and Tabler, the architect who approved the design of the shaft in which the elevator was housed.

---

[1]These cases involve multiple parties, and their roles are reversed from one case to the other. To simplify we will refer to the cases as *Tabler* v. *Wallace* and *General Electric* v. *Nucor,* and to the parties in their roles as plaintiff and defendants.

In the second case, *General Electric* v. *Nucor*, the loss occurred because of the collapse of the roof of a warehouse of the General Electric Company in Louisville, Kentucky. The collapse occurred because four steel beams, or trusses, intended to support the roof, failed to do so. Nucor had designed the roof and its components, including the trusses, to comply with specifications provided to it. After the design process was completed, Nucor used a standardized computer program to determine which trusses to manufacture. A Nucor employee admitted that he erred in recording a load number specified in the design on the shop list utilized to prepare the trusses. The result was that the trusses were fabricated to only one half the strength required by the design. On July 13, 1977, one of the defective trusses failed, tearing the roof and causing extensive damages. Four weeks later another defective truss collapsed causing further extensive damage to the warehouse and to inventory.

Garst-Receveur Construction Company was the builder employed by General Electric to construct the warehouse. Harmon and Conway, Inc. was the manufacturer's representative for Nucor in the Louisville area. Garst-Receveur entered into a purchase order contract with Harmon and Conway which required Harmon and Company to "furnish all steel joists and joist girders," including the trusses which failed. Harmon and Conway then entered a standard purchase order with Nucor. Garst-Receveur, the builder, and

Harmon and Conway, the supplier, were sued along with Nucor.[2]

The litigation in both *Tabler* v. *Wallace* and *General Electric* v. *Nucor* followed a similar course. In neither did the defendants attempt to plead KRS 413.135, the architects and builders "no action" statute, in response to the original complaint. Initially, in both cases, the defendants assumed that the statute was unconstitutional because our decision in *Saylor* v. *Hall*, Ky., 497 S.W.2d 218 (1973) held that it violated Sections 14, 54 and 241 of the Kentucky Constitution, which restricts legislative power to abolish or limit causes of action predating the Constitution.

In both *Tabler* v. *Wallace* and *General Electric* v. *Nucor*, the defendants were permitted to amend their answers years after the litigation commenced and shortly before trial, at the "eleventh hour," based upon a perceived change in the constitutional status of KRS 413.135 announced in December 1982 in *Carney* v. *Moody*, Ky., 646 S.W.2d 40 (1982). Once the defendants were permitted to amend, in both cases the trial court then granted the defendants summary judgment on grounds that *Carney* v. *Moody* revitalized the "no action statute" because the claims were not filed within five years of completion of construction.

---

[2]The warehouse roof collapsed in two stages. General Electric claimed that KRS 413.135 is not applicable to Nucor's alleged fraudulent concealment of the defect after the first partial collapse. Because of the decision of the unconstitutionality of the statute it is unnecessary that we address this further issue.

In *Tabler* v. *Wallace* the Kentucky Court of Appeals reversed the summary judgment on grounds that KRS 413.135 violates the equal protection provisions of both the constitution of Kentucky and the constitution of the United States. Both *Saylor* v. *Hall, supra,* and *Carney* v. *Moody, supra,* considered and analyzed KRS 413.135 "only" under Sections 14, 54 and 241 of the Kentucky Constitution prohibiting the abolition of legal remedies for wrongful death, personal injury, property damages or defamation, but left the question of equal protection an open matter. 497 S.W.2d at 223. The Court of Appeals considered the equal protection and special legislation arguments and concluded that this statute was nothing more than a grant of immunity, arbitrary in nature, with no reasonable basis for a separate classification.

Because of the importance of this constitutional question, we granted discretionary review.[3] The Court of Appeals then asked that we accept transfer of *General Electric* v. *Nucor,* involving the same constitutional question, pending before the Court of Appeals. We granted transfer and consolidated the cases for argument and consideration.

KRS 413.135 derives from legislation commencing in the mid-1960's drafted and promoted by three groups engaged in the construction industry: architects, en-

---

[3]The Court of Appeals ruled adversely to defendants' claim that the constitutional issue was not preserved. The constitutional issue was the reason we granted discretionary review. We express no opinion on the preservation issue.

gineers, and builders. These groups were the American Institute of Architects, The National Society of Professional Engineers, and The Associated General Contractors. *See Smith,* "Recent Statutory Developments Concerning the Limitations of Actions Against Architects, Engineers and Builders." 60 Ky.L.J. 462 (1971-72). Within a relatively short period of time these groups succeeded in having similar legislation enacted in almost every state. The reaction has been a multitude of cases challenging the constitutionality of this legislation on equal protection grounds. In all, we have been cited to cases from thirty-one sister states[4] and several federal jurisdictions, all addressing a constitutional

---

[4]*CONSTITUTIONAL: Carter* v. *Hartenstein,* 455 S.W.2d 918 (Ark. 1970), *appeal dismissed,* 401 U.S. 901 (1971); *Salinero* v. *Pon,* 177 Cal.Rptr. 204 (Cal. 1981); *Cheswold Volunteer Fire Co.* v. *Lambertson Construction Co.,* 462 A.2d 416 (Del.Supr. 1983); *Mullis* v. *Southern Company Services,* 296 S.E.2d 579 (Ga. 1982); *Twin Falls Clinic & Hospital Building Corp.* v. *Hamill,* 644 P.2d 341 (Idaho 1982); *Matayka* v. *Melia,* 456 N.E.2d 353 (Ill.App. 1983); *Beecher* v. *White,* 447 N.E.2d 622 (Ind.App. 1983); *Burmaster* v. *Gravity Drainage District No. 2,* 366 So.2d 1381 (La. 1978); *Klein* v. *Catalano,* 437 N.E.2d 514 (Mass. 1982); *O'Brien* v. *Hazelet & Erdal,* 299 N.W.2d 336 (Mich. 1980); *Calder* v. *City of Crystal,* 318 N.W.2d 838 (Minn. 1982); *Anderson* v. *Fred Wagner & Roy Anderson, Jr., Inc.,* 402 So.2d 320 (Miss. 1981); *Reeves.* v. *Ille Electric Co.,* 551 P.2d 647 (Mont. 1976); *Rosenberg* v. *Town of North Bergen,* 293 A.2d 662 (N.J. 1972); *Howell* v. *Burk,* 568 P.2d 214 (N.M. 1977); *Lamb* v. *Wedgewood South Corp.,* 302 S.E.2d 868 (N.C. 1983); *Hartford Fire Insurance Co.* v. *Lawrence, Dykes, Goddenberger, Bower & Clancy,* ___ F.2d _____, nos. 82-3404; 82-3419 (6th Cir. July 31, 1984); *Freezer Storage, Inc.* v. *Armstrong Cork Co.,* 382 A.2d 715 (Pa. 1978); *McMacken* v. *South Dakota,* 320 N.W.2d 131 (S.D. 1982); *Harmon* v. *Angus R. Jessup Assoc.,* 619 S.W.2d 522 (Tenn. 1981); *Sowders* v. *M.W. Kellogg Co.,* 663 S.W.2d 644 (Tex. App. 1 Dist. 1983); *Good* v. *Christensen,* 527 P.2d 223 (Utah 1974); *Yakima Fruit & Cold Storage Co.* v. *Central Heating & Plumbing Co.,* 503 P.2d 108 (Wash. 1972).

UNCONSTITUTIONAL: Shibuya v. *Architects Hawaii Ltd.,* 647 P.2d 276 (Hawaii 1982); *Skinner* v. *Anderson,* 231 N.E.2d 588 (Ill. 1967); *Pacific Indemnity Co.* v. *Thompson-Yeager, Inc.,* 260 N.W. 2d 548 (Minn. 1977); *State Farm Fire and Casualty Co.* v. *All Electric, Inc.,* 660 P.2d 995 (Nev. 1983); *Henderson Clay Products, Inc.* v. *Edgar Wood & Assoc.,* 451 A.2d 174 (N.H. 1982); *Loyal Order of Moose, Lodge 1785* v. *Cavaness,* 563 P.2d 143 (Okla. 1977); *Broome* v. *Truluck,* 241 S.E.2d 739 (S.C. 1978); *Kallas Millwork Corp.* v. *Square D Co.,* 225 N.W.2d 454 (Wis. 1975); *Phillips ABC Builders, Inc.,* 611 P.2d 821 (Wyo. 1980).

challenge on equal protection grounds to this type of statute. If nothing else, the large number of cases illustrates the magnitude of the problem.

Many of these cases from foreign jurisdictions uphold the constitutionality of this legislation against the challenge on equal protection grounds, but turn on the language of the particular state constitution involved. A lesser number of cases, but a growing number, hold to the contrary. In general, the cases holding the statute unconstitutional have followed the reasoning of the first case to do so, *Skinner* v. *Anderson,* 231 N.E.2d 588 (Ill. 1967):

> [T]he statute singles out the architect and the contractor, and grants them immunity. It is not at all inconceivable that the owner or person in control of such an improvement might be held liable for damage or injury that results from a defective condition for which the architect or contractor is in fact [primarily] responsible. . . . the statute takes away [the owner's] action for indemnity against the architect or contractor.
>
> The arbitrary quality of the statute clearly appears when we consider that architects and contractors are not the only persons whose negligence in the construction of a building or other improvement may cause damage to property or injury to persons. If, for example, four years after a building is completed the cornice should fall because the adhesive used was defective, the manufacturer of the adhesive is granted no immunity. And so it is with all others who furnished materials used in

> constructing the improvement. But if the cornice fell because of defective design or construction for which an architect or contractor was responsible, immunity is granted. It cannot be said that one event is more likely than the other to occur . . . ." 231 N.E.2d at 591.

Defendants claim that insofar as the challenge to constitutionality under the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, the United States Supreme Court's denial of certiorari in *Carter* v. *Hartenstein,* 455 S.W.2d 918 (Ark. 1970), appeal dismissed, 401 U.S. 901 (1971), is decisive. However, dismissal for lack of a substantial federal question is a summary disposition and not conclusive precedent, to be accorded "appropriate, but not necessarily conclusive, weight." *Mandel* v. *Bradley,* 432 U.S. 173, 180, 53 L.Ed.2d 199, 97 S.Ct. 2238 (1977).

Before considering the federal constitutional challenge, a threshold question is whether the statute is unconstitutional under a different and narrower provision of the Kentucky constitution. *See Fannin* v. *Williams,* Ky., 655 S.W.2d 480 (1983). We have decided that KRS 413.135 violates Section 59(5) of the Kentucky Constitution, which is more detailed and specific than the equal protection clause of the Federal Constitution. We declare the statute unconstitutional on state grounds, and do not reach the federal question.

The Kentucky Constitution, Section 59, is entitled "Local and special legislation." It provides:

"The General Assembly shall not pass local or special acts concerning any of the following subjects, or for any of the following purposes, namely:

. . . .

Fifth: To regulate the limitation of civil or criminal causes."

When considered against its historical background, it is evident that Section 59 is more than simply another way of restating the generalized language of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. Indeed, Sections 1, 2 and 3 of the Kentucky Constitution which provide that the General Assembly is denied arbitrary power and shall treat all persons equally, suffice to embrace the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

But the debates of the Kentucky Constitutional Convention of 1890 and its detailed list particularizing twenty-nine different subjects where the "General Assembly shall not pass local or special acts" provide convincing evidence of the reasons for Section 59, prohibiting local and special legislation. *See* Debates, Constitutional Convention of 1890, 4 Vol.

The history of the times and the nature of the problem becomes clear when one reads the debates. Unbridled legislative power had become the captive of special interest groups. Concern for limiting the powers of the legislature in general, and with cutting off special

and local legislation in particular, was the primary motivating force behind enactment of the new Kentucky Constitution of 1891.

Limitations of time and space prevent restating the proceedings in detail. A few excerpts will suffice:

Delegate Mackoy:

> ". . . now, if there is any one evil more than another which the people of this State have earnestly demanded should be corrected by this Convention, it was that local and special legislation should be rooted up entirely . . . ." Vol. 3, p. 4019.

Delegate Young:

> "no special provisions for anybody, no exemptions, but all to have the same protection and all live under the same law, and no special benefits to anybody . . . ." Vol. 3, p. 3996-97.

Delegate Knox:

> ". . . look at the ponderous volumes of private acts passed our Legislature within the last few years, and enumerate the horde of railroad and other corporations which have been exempted from taxation, and allowed a variety of other special privileges, while battening like vampires upon the substance of the people. . . ." Vol. 1, p. 466.

Delegate Carroll:

> ". . . except for the vicious legislation and the local and special laws of all kinds and character passed by the Legislatures that have met in Kentucky for the last twenty years, that no proposition to call a Constitutional Convention could ever have received a majority of the votes of the people of Kentucky." Vol. 1, p. 1482.

City of Louisville v. *Kuntz,* 104 Ky. 584, 47 S.W. 592 (1898) followed with the new constitution fresh in mind. Our Court struck down as special legislation an act of the General Assembly providing a shorter statute of limitations for cities than existed for other claims for personal injury or property damage. The Court stated:

> "Section 59 of the Constitution expressly prohibits the legislature from passing a local or special act relating to limitation, and this case clearly illustrates the wisdom of the provision."

Attempted justification for a special protected classification for cities in 1898 would be more easily understood than the attempt to justify a special classification for architects, engineers and builders in 1965. Nevertheless, such special classification could not withstand constitutional challenge.

Other cases invalidating special statutes of limitations under Section 59(5) of the Kentucky Constitution

include *Commonwealth* v. *McCoun,* Ky., 313 S.W.2d 585 (1958); *City of Louisville* v. *Louisville Taxicab & Transfer Co.,* Ky., 238 S.W.2d 121 (1951); and *Gorley* v. *City of Louisville,* Ky., 47 S.W. 263 (1898).

In *City of Louisville* v. *Klusmeyer,* Ky., 324 S.W.2d 831 (1959), our Court struck down a statute seeking to protect city government by imposing primary liability upon the abutting property owner for injuries caused by defects in the sidewalk in cities of the first-class. Although our Constitution permits special legislation made local to a particular class of city where it pertains to organization and government, it prohibits other legislation made applicable to a single class "not based upon a natural, real or substantial distinction inhering in the subject matter." 324 S.W.2d at 834.

In contrast to the extensive history of our present constitution, the absence of any legislative history for KRS 413.135 is equally revealing. We know who initiated and lobbied for the legislation, but we know of no committee meetings or legislative debate discussing its purpose. The only legislative "history," as such, for KRS 413.135, is that contained in the title to the act:

> "An Act relating to the Statutes of Limitations governing the bringing of certain types of actions for wrongful death, personal injuries or damage to real or personal property, and creating a new section of Kentucky Revised Statutes, Chapter 413." Ky.Acts Ch. 246 (1966).

This title serves more to conceal than to reveal the nature of the act. It is an act which denies the right to sue for any cause (not just "wrongful death, personal injuries or damage to . . . property") five years following the substantial completion of construction. It does not function as a statute of limitations, but only to cut off claims which have not accrued within that period. It specifically provides that it does not supplant or extend existing limitations of actions pertaining to the same subject matter, such as one year after the cause of action accrues for personal injury or wrongful death (KRS 413.140) and five years after the cause of action accrues for property damage (KRS 413.120). Instead, KRS 413.135 functions as a one-way ticket to "Topsy-Turvy Land," a place described by Judge Jerome Frank in *Dincher* v. *Marlin Firearms Co.*, 198 F.2d 821, 823 (2d Cir. 1952), where you "die before you are conceived, or be divorced before every you marry, or harvest a crop never planted, or burn down a house never built, or miss a train running on a nonexistent railroad."

The argument is that the act is called a "statute of limitations" but its purpose is not to limit the time in which to bring causes of action which have accrued but to extinguish causes of action which have not yet accrued, and that, whereas the title to the act is generalized, the contents of the act refer to a narrowly defined and exclusively protected class. The Alabama Supreme Court has invalidated a similar architects and builders immunity statute under that state's counterpart to Section 51 of the Kentucky Constitution. We

need not decide the constitutional challenge presented by Section 51, since we have decided this case under Section 59(5). However, the arguably deceptive nature of the title of this act re-enforces the perception that it was enacted in response to a lobbying effort rather than because of reasonable, natural and justifiable distinctions between the protected group and others.

The fundamental question is whether the General Assembly had a reasonable basis for this legislation sufficient to justify creating a separate classification for certain persons engaged in the construction of improvements to real property, granting these persons a special immunity. cf. *Miles* v. *Shauntee,* Ky., 664 S.W.2d 512 (1984); *Board of Education of Jefferson County* v. *Board of Education of Louisville,* Ky., 472 S.W.2d 496 (1971). The South Carolina court stated in *Broome* v. *Truluck,* 241 S.E.2d 739 (S.C. 1978):

> "While it is broadly stated that a vital distinction exists between architects, engineers and contractors on the one hand and owners and manufacturers on the other, such vital distinction is no where pointed out such as to justify granting immunity to one group and not to the other." *Id* at 740.

A number of different reasons have been suggested by the defendants and those filing amicus curiae briefs on their behalf for creating a separate classification for these groups. But these are offered only as possible reasons that could have existed, not as reasons that did in fact exist. The justifications offered are largely

self-contradictory. For instance, one brief argues that the justification for the statute is to prevent the protected class from being inundated by law suits; another that ninety percent or more the cases of this type involved damages or injuries occurring within five years of construction and the statute addresses very few stale claims that present a disproportionate and excessive burden on the building industry.

One brief argues that it is reasonable to protect architects and builders and not product manufacturers and suppliers because product manufacturers and suppliers can utilize factory control and pretesting procedures and thus control their negligence in a way not available to architects and builders; another that the public does not need the same protection from architects and builders that it needs from product manufacturers and suppliers, because architects and builders have inspectors constantly looking over their shoulders and because no building can be occupied until after it has been thoroughly inspected.

The same evidentiary difficulties that confront builders and architects confront every litigant involved in an injury arising from the construction of an improvement to real property. As stated in *Overland Construction Co.* v. *Sirmons,* 369 So.2d 572 (Fla. 1979):

> "Undoubtedly, the passage of time does aggravate the difficulty of producing reliable evidence . . . .The impact of these problems, however,

> is felt by all litigants. Moreover, the difficulties of proof would seem to fall at least as heavily on injured plaintifs, who must generally carry the initial burden of establishing that the defendant was negligent." *Id.* at 574.

One defendant conceded that the justifications offered were self-contradictory, but argued that their contradictory nature was immaterial so long as one or the other of the reasons is not irrational. The creative abilities of lawyers suggesting possible reasons after the fact does not suffice to provide the kind of justification that is required for special legislation to be valid under Section 59 of the Kentucky Constitution.

Defense counsels' arguments throughout have been to the effect that any reason however imaginative that *could* have existed requires us to uphold otherwise discriminatory legislation. On the contrary, there must be a substantial and justifiable reason apparent from legislative history, from the statute's title, preamble or subject matter, or from some other authoritative source.

One of the principal arguments offered in support of special protection for architects and builders as contrasted with product manufacturers and suppliers is the supposed distinction between providing goods and services. To explore this argument requires some brief historical reflection.

There has never been any distinction under a negligence theory of liability between the treatment of

goods and services. Following a landmark English case decided in 1842, *Winterbottom* v. *Wright,* 10 M. & W. 109, 152 Eng.Rep. 402 (1842), which *in fact* "held only that the obligation of a contract could give no right of action to one who was not a contracting party (Prosser, *Law of Torts,* 4th Ed. 1971)," American courts erroneously applied to tort cases the contract doctrine of privity. They held that there must be a contractual relationship between the parties as a prerequisite to tort liability. This error was exposed and corrected for negligence cases by Justice Benjamin Cordozo in the landmark case of *MacPherson* v. *Buick Motor Co.,* 111 N.E.2d 1050 (N.Y. 1916). Following the demise of the erroneous defense of privity in negligence cases, there was a growing number of suits against architects and builders based on defects in construction. *See* Smith, *Recent Statutory Developments Concerning the Limitations of Actions Against Architects, Engineers, and Builders, supra.* It was this growing number of suits, not any distinction in negligence law between goods and services, that caused certain professional groups to lobby for special legislation. For similar reasons the railroads and others had sought and obtained special privileges from the General Assembly during the 1880's and thus precipitated a constitutional convention.

Nothing in this set of circumstances provided a constitutionally acceptable reason to discriminate between goods and services. In *In Re Beverly Hills Fire Litigation,* Ky., 672 S.W.2d 922 (1984), we pointed out

that this statute excluded materialmen for no well considered "reason," but because they were not "among the pressure groups initiating the legislation." 672 S.W.2d at 925. Landowners are similarly excluded from this protection. Thus, whatever the statutory objective, it was achieved by this statute in a discriminatory fashion. The express purpose of Section 59(5) of the Constitution is to prevent those who have sufficient political power or who can afford a persuasive lobbyist from achieving immunity from accountability to the law that governs others. *See Phillips* v. *ABC Builders,* 611 P.2d 821 (Wyo. 1980), invalidating an architects and builders immunity statute under a constitutional provision substantially identical to our Kentucky Constitution Section 59(5).

In the last twenty years an *additional* theory of liability labeled "strict liability in tort" has developed against products manufacturers and suppliers who fall within the class described in Section 402A of the *Restatement (Second) Torts.* But there has never been any distinction under a negligence theory between the treatment of goods and services.

Tort Law in America, An Intellectual History, by Prof. G. Edward White of the University of Virginia Law School, traces the growth and development of tort law from the common law writ system to the negligence theory during the last half of the last century and the early part of this one. The treatment of the concept of

negligence as expressing a universal duty is a hundred years old.

> "The growth of negligence from the omission of a preexisting, specific duty owed to a limited class of persons to the violation of a generalized standard of care owed to all ensured the emergence of Torts as an independent branch of law." G.E. White, *Tort Law in America, An Intellectual History,* 18 (1980).

The concept of negligence preexisted the Kentucky Constitution. The question debated in *Saylor* v. *Hall, supra,* and *Carney* v. *Moody, supra,* was whether the privity requirement was part of the negligence concept in the period before the 1891 Constitution. A 1905 case, *Simons* v. *Gregory,* 120 Ky. 116, 85 S.W. 751 (1905), is cited for the proposition that it was. However, this reads more into *Simons* v. *Gregory* than the language of the opinion provides. *Carney* v. *Moody* reached an opposite result from *Saylor* v. *Hall* while conceding there was no "factual distinction" and without overruling it.

We need not write Chapter Three to *Saylor* v. *Hall* and *Carney* v. *Moody*. The inquiry has shifted from whether the statute is arbitrary and discriminatory, to constitutional issues not discussed in those opinions, equal protection and special legislation. With this the issue, constitutionality does not turn on deciphering the status of the cause of action "prior to the adoption of the Constitution (*Carney* v. *Moody, supra,* 646

S.W.2d at 41)," but on whether the General Assembly had a rational justification for creating a special class and conferring special privileges and immunity on that class at the time the statute in question was enacted. No substantial reason has been presented to us.

The only apparent basis for the present legislation is that a special class, builders, architects and engineers involved in construction, faced with a growing exposure to litigation, lobbied for a statute limiting their liability. There is no social or economic basis presented to justify a special class, only their own self-interest. Other groups similarly situated do not share in their legislative windfall. Their subjective reasons will not withstand public policy analysis.

The general public is exposed to injury, death and property damage from the collapse of a building. As in the recent catastrophe involving the collapse of the overhead walkway in the Hyatt Regency Hotel in Kansas City, many people from all walks of life may be injured in one catastrophe caused by faulty construction. The protection of the general public is sacrificed to the interest of a special group. This is the essence of the constitutional evil addressed by Section 59, the prohibition against local and special legislation.

Where to draw the line as to what constitutes a "reasonable basis" for otherwise discriminatory legislation is a difficult matter. We do not do so here beyond stating that imaginative reasons that *could* exist,

without anything of a positive nature to suggest that they *did* exist, do not suffice.

In Re Beverly Hills Fire Litigation, supra, held that KRS 413.135 had no application to the manufacturers of aluminum wire used in the electrical circuits in the Beverly Hills Supper Club. We concluded that the statute was not intended to cover products manufacturers, suppliers and materialmen, based on the express language of the statute, the history of its development, and the constitutionally impermissible arbitrariness of attempting a distinction between products utilized as component parts in a building and the same other products not so utilized. One of the principal arguments between the parties in the present case is whether or not certain of the defendants should be classified as products manufacturers and suppliers, not including within the terms of KRS 413.135. Both sides rely on the *Beverly Hills Fire Litigation* case in support of their arguments.

In *Tabler* v. *Wallace,* one of the principal defendants is Dover Elevator Co. which, through its predecessor, manufactured and supplied the elevator and also assisted in the design and construction of the portion of the building which housed it. If there is liability it is based upon a combination of the elevator which is a product, and the shaft which is not, and Dover Elevator Co. had a hand in both items.

In *General Electric Co.* v. *Nucor,* General Electric makes a plausible argument that the gravamen of the action is not the design or construction of the roof, or even the trusses, but an admitted error in what is a standardized process for manufacturing girders which are essentially uniform in nature. So viewed, Nucor is a products manufacturer and Harman & Conway, Inc. is a products supplier.

We need not attempt to unravel the dilemma which occurs in both of these cases in attempting a rational distinction between the role of products manufacturers or suppliers on the one hand, and design and construction on the other. It suffices that the argument highlights the arbitrariness of providing an immunity to those engaged in design and construction of a real estate improvement which does not extend to others similarly situated. It was this type of arbitrariness that Kentucky Constitution Section 59 in general, and Subsection 5 in particular, was designed to prevent.

The continuing viability of Section 59 of the Kentucky Constitution has been recently expounded in *Miles* v. *Shauntee, supra,* and in *Board of Education of Jefferson County* v. *Board of Education of Louisville, supra. Commonwealth* v. *O'Harrah,* 262 S.W.2d 385, 389 (1953) states our duty to support both the "letter and spirit" of the Constitution. We "may not countenance an evasion or even an unintentional avoidance of our fundamental law." *Id.* KRS 413.135

is in fundamental conflict with Kentucky Constitution Section 59(5) and its historical development.

The decision of the Court of Appeals in *Tabler* v. *Wallace* is affirmed. The decision of the trial court in *General Electric* v. *Nucor* is reversed. Both cases are remanded to the trial courts for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

Stephens, C.J., Aker, Gant, and Leibson, JJ., concur in both cases. Vance, J., concurs in *General Electric* v. *Nucor,* but dissents in *Tabler* v. *Wallace.* Stephenson, J., dissents in both cases by separate dissenting opinion. Wintersheimer, J., dissents in both cases.

ATTORNEYS FOR MOVANT, TABLER:

W. T. Adkins
Ronald L. Green
444 W. Second Street
Lexington, KY 40508

ATTORNEYS FOR MOVANT, DOVER ELEV.:

Robert H. Measle
Suite 4-A
Citizens Bank Square
Lexington, KY 40507

ATTORNEY FOR RESPONDENTS,
MARY L. WALLACE, ET AL.:

Peter Perlman
388 S. Broadway
Lexington, KY 40508

ATTORNEY FOR AMICUS CURIAE,
PRC Engineering, Inc.:

Laurence J. Zielke
A. Neal Herrington
Frank G. Simpson III
1705 Meidinger Tower
Louisville, KY 40202

ATTORNEY FOR AMICUS CURIAE,
KY. HOME BUILDERS ASSN.:

W. Terry McBrayer
Jo Ann Alexander
400 American Bank Bldg.
Short & Upper Streets
Lexington, KY 40507

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLANTS,
GENERAL ELECTRIC, ET AL.:

Sheryl G. Snyder
Francis J. Mellen, Jr.
Virginia H. Snell
Citizens Plaza
Louisville, KY 40202

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLEES,
NUCOR CORP.:

Winfrey P. Blackburn, Jr.
W. Kennedy Simpson
600 W. Main Street
Louisville, KY 40202

William A. Miller, Sr.
725 Marion E. Taylor Bldg.
Louisville, KY 40202

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLEES,
HARMAN & COMPANY, JACOB HARMAN,
AND POLK COMPANY:

Ronald V. Simpson
2800 First National Tower
Louisville, KY 40202

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLEE,
GARST-RECEVEUR:

Victor W. Ewen
Campbell Ewen
650 Starks Bldg.
Louisville, KY 40202

RENDERED: November 21, 1985
TO BE PUBLISHED

SUPREME COURT OF KENTUCKY
84-SC-844-DG
85-SC-63-TRG

WILLIAM B. TABLER, ARCHITECT
and DOVER ELEVATOR COMPANY MOVANTS

ON REVIEW FROM COURT OF APPEALS

V. #83-CA-2160-MR
(Fayette Circuit Court #81-CI-1066)

MARY L. WALLACE, ADMINISTRATRIX
OF THE ESTATE OF WILLIAM WALLACE,
and MARY L. WALLACE,
INDIVIDUALLY RESPONDENTS

AND

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY,
ARKWRIGHT-BOSTON MANUFACTURERS,
MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY, AND
INDUSTRIAL RISK INSURERS APPELLANTS

APPEAL FROM JEFFERSON CIRCUIT COURT

V. HON. BENJAMIN F. SHOBE, JUDGE
NO. 79-CI-01275

NUCOR CORPORATION,
HARMAN & CONWAY, INC.,
JACOB A. HARMAN, POLK &
CONWAY, AND GARST-RECEVEUR
CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, INC. APPELLEES

DISSENTING OPINION BY JUSTICE STEPHENSON

From a reading of the majority opinion, as it applies to *Tabler* v. *Wallace,* I conclude that this is an opinion of great significance to bench and bar. The significance that I attach to the opinion is not in what it says, but in what it does not say.

The issue upon which this case was decided by the Court of Appeals and this court was not presented to the trial court; thus, it was not preserved for appellate review. In reversing the trial court, the Court of Appeals carefully avoided saying that the trial court was in error. Instead, in an obscure footnote, the Court of Appeals refers to arguments about non-preservation, etc., and concludes the arguments are not persuasive. This elevates judicial obfuscation to new heights. The record is clear that the issue was not presented to the trial court. Wallace does not argue otherwise. Apparently, considering that an obscure footnote is a proper judicial burial place for a well established rule of law, the majority opinion, by footnote, observes that the Court of Appeals ruled adversely to the claim that the constitutional issue was not preserved; then; like Pontius Pilate, the majority washes its hands of the issue by saying we express no opinion on the preservation.

I daresay the reader of the majority opinion would discern through the judicial fog that there was some issue about preservation in the Court of Appeals, and it was not worthy of further comment.

Towards the end of the majority opinion, it is stated: "We may not countenance an evasion or even an unintentional avoidance of our fundamental law." This is a lofty sentiment about the constitution and should apply equally to a rule of law of preservation of issues for appellate review.

This noble sentiment will be small comfort to those members of the bar who have lost in this court and the Court of Appeals for the reason that an issue was not preserved.

The language "not preserved for appellate review" is to be found in a multitude of opinions but, apparently now and in the future, we will be treated to a selective system of application of the rule. When it feels good, the rule can be ignored in an obscure footnote.

In this court, the lawyer for Wallace makes the strange argument that somehow this issue could not be presented to the trial court until after judgment (the issue was not presented after judgment either). In *General Electric* v. *Nucor,* the issue was presented to the trial court, thus preserving it.

Manifest injustice is also argued, but not why we should invoke this principle. Presumably, Wallace will feel distressed, but this is not enough. Wallace's lawyer should have raised the issue if he wanted us to consider it.

In matters of this importance, the reasons for not following the rule on preservation should spelled out so that the bar will have some indication of the circumstances in which this rule will be applied in the future. The trial court had no opportunity to rule on the issue. The judgment of the trial court should be affirmed and the Court of Appeals reversed.

Accordingly, I dissent from the holding in *Tabler* v. *Wallace.*

Vance and Wintersheimer, JJ., join in this dissent.

I also dissent from the holding in *General Electric* v. *Nucor* for the reason that I do not believe KRS 413.135 violates Section 59 of the Kentucky Constitution.

Wintersheimer, J., joins in this dissent.

APPENDIX B

FILED	RECEIVED
DEC 30 1985	DEC 30 1985
John C. Scott	JOHN C. SCOTT
CLERK	CLERK
SUPREME COURT	COURT OF APPEALS

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
SUPREME COURT
NO. 84-SC-844-D

WILLIAM B. TABLER, Architect
and DOVER ELEVATOR COMPANY PETITIONERS

V. **RESPONSE TO JOINT PETITION FOR REHEARING**

MARY L. WALLACE, Administratrix
of the Estate of WILLIAM WALLACE
and MARY L. WALLACE
Individually RESPONDENT

REVIEW OF APPEAL 83-CA-2160-MR
FROM FAYETTE CIRCUIT COURT

BRIEF FOR THE RESPONDENT
MARY L. WALLACE, Administratrix
of the Estate of WILLIAM WALLACE,
and MARY L. WALLACE, Individually

PETER PERLMAN
PETER PERLMAN LAW OFFICES, P.S.C.
388 SOUTH BROADWAY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40508
Telephone (606) 253-3919
ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT,
MARY L. WALLACE, ADMINISTRATRIX
OF THE ESTATE OF WILLIAM
WALLACE, AND MARY L. WALLACE,
INDIVIDUALLY

This is to certify that pursuant to CR 76.12(5), copies of the within Brief for Respondent have been served upon Hon. W. T. Adkins, Hon. Ronald L. Green, Boehl, Stopher, Graves & Deindoerfer, 444 West Second Street, Lexington, Kentucky; Hon. Robert H. Measle, Fowler, Measle & Bell, Suite 4-A, Citizens Bank Square, Lexington, Kentucky 40507; Hon. John P. Hayes, Chief Judge, Hon. Boyce G. Clayton, Judge, Hon. Harris S. Howard, Judge, Kentucky Court of Appeals, 403 Wapping Street, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601, and Hon. James E. Keller, Judge, Fayette Circuit Court, Fayette County Courthouse, Lexington, Kentucky 40507, this the 30th day of December, 1985.

/s/ Peter Perlman
ATTORNEY FOR RESPONDENT

COUNTERSTATEMENT OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

PURPOSE OF BRIEF 1

KRS 413.135 ..... 1, 2, 3, 4

ARGUMENT I

THE ISSUE LITIGATED AT THE CIRCUIT COURT WAS THE RETROACTIVITY OF *CARNEY* V. *MOODY*. 2

Saylor v. *Hall*,
Ky., 497 S.W.2d 218 (1973) 2, 3

Carney v. *Moody*,
Ky., 646 S.W.2d 40 (1983) 2, 3

ARGUMENT II

THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF KRS 413.135 WAS RAISED AND PRESERVED BY OBJECTION AT THE TRIAL COURT LEVEL. . 3

ARGUMENT III

TO DISMISS THE RESPONDENT'S CAUSE OF ACTION WOULD REPRESENT MANIFEST INJUSTICE. 4

Pittsburgh and Midway Mining Co. v. *Rushing*,
Ky., 456 S.W.2d 816, 818 (1969) 4

ARGUMENT IV

ANY FAILURE TO NOTIFY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL WAS CURED BY HIS DECISION NOT TO INTERVENE. 5

CONCLUSION 5

PURPOSE OF BRIEF

The Supreme Court of Kentucky, by its Opinion rendered on November 21, 1985, affirmed the decision of the Court of Appeals holding KRS 413.135 unconstitutional. The opinion remanded the case of *Tabler* v. *Wallace* (file No. 84-SC-844-DG) to the trial court for proceedings consistent with the opinion. Petitioners William B. Tabler and Dover Elevator Company have filed a Joint Petition for Rehearing. This Brief is submitted in response to the Petitioners' Joint Petition.

KRS 413.135 was relied upon by the Petitioners in obtaining summary judgment in defense of the wrongful death action brought by Respondent Mary Wallace. The Petition for Rehearing does not focus upon the Supreme Court's invalidation of the statute of repose. Rather, Petitioners' argument is based upon two alleged procedural errors on the part of the Respondent: (1) the failure to raise a constitutional attack on KRS 413.135 at the Circuit Court level; and (2) the failure to timely notify the Attorney General of the intention to attack the constitutionality of KRS 413.135.

Neither of the above arguments represent a new issue in these proceedings. Both claims have been previously raised and disposed of by the Court of Appeals and the Kentucky Supreme Court. The Kentucky Supreme Court has recognized the constitutionality of KRS 413.135 to be an issue of extreme magnitude and worthy of its attention. In fact, this issue was considered so significant that the Supreme Court accepted

transfer of the companion case, *General Electric* v. *Nucor,* (85-SC-63-TRG) by waiving the jurisdiction and necessary proceedings in the Court of Appeals.

Petitioners seek a dismissal of Mrs. Wallace's cause of action. Besides being manifestly unjust, such a result would make no sense from a jurisprudential point of view. It would apply the workings of the unconstitutional statute upon Mrs. Wallace, at whose time, energy and expense the constitutional issue was brought before the Court.

ARGUMENT

I. THE ISSUE LITIGATED AT THE CIRCUIT COURT WAS THE RETROACTIVITY OF *CARNEY* V. *MOODY.*

Since its passage in 1966 by the General Assembly, the constitutional status of KRS 413.135 has changed three times. In 1973, the Kentucky Supreme Court held the statute to be an unconstitutional bar to actions involving improvements to real estate completed prior to the passage of the statute. *Saylor* v. *Hall,* Ky., 497 S.W.2d 218 (1973). In 1983, under *Carney* v. *Moody,* Ky., 646 S.W.2d 40, the Court overruled *Saylor* and held the statute to be constitutional. The Majority's Opinion of November 21, 1985 again held KRS 413.135 to be unconstitutional.

Respondent Mary Wallace's wrongful death action was filed on January 19, 1981. The issue litigated at the trial court was the retroactivity of the *Carney*

decision, and thus whether the statute was applicable to the case at bar. The Circuit Court's Opinion of June 22, 1983 regarding the Petitioners' *Motion for Summary Judgment* recognized this, stating as follows:

> [T]he dispositive issue of law is whether the Supreme Court of Kentucky's decision in *Carney, et al.* v. *Moody, et al.* Ky., 646 S.W.2d 40 (1983) shall be applied retroactively in this case.

(A copy of the Circuit Court's Opinion is attached as Appendix A.)

Availability of a statute does not give rise to the issue of classes created by operation of the statute. The equal protection issues became ripe for decision only upon entry of Summary Judgment, when the discriminatory classifications of the statute became real and apparent.

II. THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF KRS 413.135 WAS RAISED AND PRESERVED BY OBJECTION AT THE TRIAL COURT LEVEL.

Respondent objected to the application of KRS 413.135 to the case at bar before the entry of judgment by the Circuit Court. Respondent submitted the following in her *Reply Memorandum* in objection to the Petitioners' *Motion for Leave to Amend Answer:*

> At the time the injuries to William Wallace occurred, in January, 1980, the holding in *Saylor* v. *Hall* was effective and KRS 413.135 had no force and effect of law. . . . . For that reason defense asserted by the Defendants in their Amended Answer is one that is not a valid one under the facts of this case. (Respondent's *Reply Memorandum,* page 2, January 28, 1983).

After the Petitioners were allowed to amend their Answer, Respondent renewed her objection. Again the objection was the authority applicable to the Respondent's case. In other words, the constitutionality of KRS 413.135 was raised when the Respondent cited *Saylor* v. *Hall* as the appropriate authority.

III. TO DISMISS THE RESPONDENT'S CAUSE OF ACTION WOULD REPRESENT MANIFEST INJUSTICE.

As recognized by the Petitioners in their Petition for Rehearing, Kentucky law allows an exception that permits appellate review in situations to the case at bar:

> The rule is firmly established that the trial court should first be given the opportunity to rule on questions before they are available for appellate review. It is only to *avert manifest injustice* that this court will entertain an argument not first presented to the trial court. [emphasis added.]

Pittsburgh and Midway Coal Mining Co. v. *Rushing*, Ky., 456 S.W.2d 816, 818 (1969).

Respondent Mary Wallace's action is for the wrongful death of her husband, William Wallace. Mr. Wallace was killed while attempting to service an elevator designed and manufactured by the Petitioner, Dover Elevator Company. The elevator shaft in question was designed by Petitioner William B. Tabler, an architect. The action is based upon a claim of defective design, construction and negligent use of the elevator and the elevator shaft.

Respondent Mary Wallace initiated her wrongful death action over four years ago. Her cause of action has encountered proceedings in three courts, but has never been tried on the merits. It was through her perseverance that the issue of the constitutionality of KRS 413.135 was brought before the court. To dismiss her cause of action and deny her a trial on the merits at this juncture would represent manifest injustice.

Respondent fails to see how the Petitioners would be prejudiced by simply having to defend the case on the merits without the shield of a statute that has been declared unconstitutional. It should be noted that the Petitioners saw no problem in evoking the requirements and necessity of justice when they sought to amend their answers with an affirmative defense two years after the original filing.

IV. ANY FAILURE TO NOTIFY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL WAS CURED BY HIS DECISION NOT TO INTERVENE.

The Attorney General notified all interested parties of his intent not to intervene on October 25, 1983. (Appendix B) This renders the argument of the Petitioners moot and without merit. Again, there has been no showing that the Petitioners have been prejudiced in any way.

CONCLUSION

Petitoners' Joint Petition for Rehearing raises claims which have been previously addressed and disposed of by the Court of Appeals and the Kentucky Supreme Court. It is within the public interest and clearly within the province of this Court to analyze discriminatory classifications under the equal protection clause of the Kentucky Constitution at any time the issue arises. The dismissal of Mary Wallace's claim would apply the unconstitutional statute against her. Such a result would be manifestly unjust.

For the foregoing reasons, Respondent requests that the Petitioners' Joint Petition for Rehearing be dismissed.

Respectfully submitted,

PETER PERLMAN LAW OFFICES, P.S.C.
388 SOUTH BROADWAY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40508
BY: /s/ Peter Perlman
PETER PERLMAN
ATTORNEY FOR RESPONDENT

* * * * * * *

APPENDIX C

Supreme Court of Kentucky

84-SC844-DG
85-SC-63-TRG

WILLIAM B. TABLER, ARCHITECT
AND DOVER ELEVATOR
COMPANY — MOVANTS

ON REVIEW FROM COURT OF APPEALS
83-CA-2160-MR
(Fayette Circuit Court No. 81-CI-0166)

MARY L. WALLACE, ADMINISTRATRIX
OF THE ESTATE OF WILLIAM WALLACE
AND MARY L. WALLACE,
INDIVIDUALLY — RESPONDENTS

AND

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY
ARKWRIGHT-BOSTON MANUFACTURERS
MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY, AND
INDUSTRIAL RISK INSURERS — APPELLANTS

V. APPEAL FROM JEFFERSON CIRCUIT COURT
HONORABLE BENJAMIN F. SHOBE, JUDGE
No. 79-CI-01275

NUCOR CORPORATION, HARMAN &
CONWAY, NC., JACOB A HARMAN,
POLK CONWAY, AND GARST-RECEVEUR
CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, INC. APPELLEES

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR REHEARING

The petition for rehearing is denied. The dissenting opinion by Stephenson, J., is modified on its face by deleting Pages 3 and 4 by substituting in lieu thereof new Pages 3, 4, and 5, attached as an appendix to this order.

ENTERED February 27, 1986.

/s/Robert F. Stephens
Chief Justice

about the constitution and should apply equally to a rule of law on preservation of issues for appellate review.

This noble sentiment will be small comfort to those members of the bar who have lost in this court and the Court of Appeals for the reason that an issue was not preserved.

The language "not preserved for appellate review" is to be found in a multitude of opinions but, appearently now and in the future, we will be treated to a selective system of application of the rule. When it feels good, the rule can be ignored in an obscure footnote.

In this court, the lawyer for Wallace makes the strange argument that somehow this issue could not be presented to the trial court until after judgment (the issue was not presented after judgment either). In General Electric v. Nucor, the issue was presented to the trial court, thus preserving it.

Manifest injustice is also argued, but not why we should invoke this principle. Presumably, Wallace will feel distressed, but this is not enough. Wallace's lawyer should have raised the issue if he wanted us to consider it.

Another facet of the nonpreservation issue is the deliberate flaunting of a legislative mandate. Having more than a passing interest in maintaining the validity of legislative enactments, the Legislature enacted KRS 418.075, the relevant portion of which provides:

> . . .In any proceeding which involves the validity of a statute, the attorney general of the state shall, before judgment is entered, be served with a copy of the petition, and shall be entitled to be heard, and if the ordinance or franchise is alleged to be unconstitutional, the attorney general of

> the state shall also be served with a copy of the petition and be entitled to be heard.

Thus, the Legislature has dictated that the Attorney General shall have a right to be heard *before judgment* when there is an attack upon the constitutionality of a statute. This seems reasonable to me, and this court has consistently required compliance with the statute, *Revis* v.*Daugherty,* 215 Ky. 823, 287 S.W. 28 (1926); *Jefferson Fiscal Court* v. *Trager,* 300 Ky. 606, 189 S.W.2d 955 (1945); and *Dewey* v. *Allinder,* Ky., 469 S.W.2d 548 (1971).

Also, this court decided that the proposition was important enough to be incorporated into our Rules. Thus, CR 24.03 provides in relevant part:

> . . .When the constitutionality of an act of the General Assembly affecting the public interest is drawn in question in any action to which the State or an officer, agency, or employee thereof is not a party, the movant shall serve notice of the motion upon the Attorney-General.

There is no pretense in *Tabler* that there was compliance with either statute or rule. The Attorney General was notified after judgment and after the notice of appeal to the Court of Appeals was filed. Understandably, he declined to intervene. No doubt he made the quaint assumption that the Court of Appeals would follow the statute, the cases based thereon, and our rules. For some strange reason, the Court of Appeals was not persuaded that the matter

was unpreserved. The majority opinion does not even consider this proposition worthy of a footnote. Undoubtedly, this passing over of a failure to follow the statute or the rule in the trial court is due to the fact that there cannot be any reasonable explanation why the proposition can be considered by this court. If the majority believes we should be perfectly flexible and choosey in preservation of arguments, it should so state. The record is there for anyone to see.

In matters of this importance, the reasons for not following the rule on preservation should be spelled out so that the bar will have some indication of the circumstances in which this rule will be applied in the future. The trial court had no opportunity to rule on the issue. The judgment of the trial court should be affirmed and the Court of Appeals reversed.

Accordingly, I dissent from the holding in *Tabler* v. *Wallace.*

Vance and Wintersheimer, JJ., join in this dissent.

I also dissent from the holding in *General Electric* v. *Nucor* for the reason that I do not believe KRS 413.135 violates Section 59 of the Kentucky Constitution.

Architects, builders, etc., comprise a large enough class with particular problems to take it out of the "special legislation" category.

Wintersheimer, J., joins in this dissent.

APPENDIX D

OPINION RENDERED:
TO BE PUBLISHED
September 7, 1984; 10:00 a.m.

Commonwealth of Kentucky

Court of Appeals

NO. 83-CA-2160-MR

MARY L. WALLACE, Administratrix
of the Estate of WILLIAM WALLACE,
and MARY L. WALLACE,
Individually APPELLANT

V. APPEAL FROM FAYETTE CIRCUIT COURT
HONORABLE JAMES E. KELLER, JUDGE
ACTION NO. 81-CI-0166

WILLIAM TABLER, Architect,
and DOVER ELEVATOR COMPANY,
HARLEY HOTELS, INC., AND
RUSSELL HALCOMB APPELLEES

REVERSING AND REMANDING

BEFORE: HAYES, CHIEF JUDGE, CLAYTON and HOWARD, Judges. CLAYTON, JUDGE. Mary L.

Wallace, individually and as administratrix of the estate of William Wallace, appeals from a summary judgment of the Fayette Circuit Court dismissing her action for the wrongful death of her late husband, mortally injured while attempting to repair an elevator at the Harley Hotel in Lexington, Kentucky. By that judgment, the lower court gave retroactive effect to the recent Kentucky decision *Carney* v. *Moody*, Ky., 646 S.W.2d 40 (1983), to find that the action by Wallace against the designing architect, elevator company, and hotel was barred by the statute of repose found at KRS 413.135, commonly referred to as the "architect's no-action statute." According to the provisions of that statute,

> Actions for damages arising out of injury resulting from construction of improvements to real estate. - - (1) No action to recover damages, whether based upon contract or sounding in tort, resulting from or arising out of any deficiency in the design, planning, supervision, inspection or construction of any improvement to real property, or for any injury to property, either real or personal, arising out of such deficiency, or for injury to the person or for wrongful death arising out of any such deficiency, shall be brought against any person performing or furnishing the design, planning, supervision, inspection or construction of any such improvement after the expiration of five (5) years following, the substantial completion of such improvement.

The sole question we are presented with on appeal is whether KRS 413.135 violates the equal protection provisions of the Constitution of Kentucky and the Constitution of the United States.[1] Neither *Saylor* v. *Hall*, Ky., 497 S.W.2d 218 (1973), nor *Carney* v. *Moody, supra*, resolves this complex question. Both of those opinions analyze KRS 413.135 under Sections 14, 54, and 241 of the Kentucky Constitution prohibiting the abolition of legal remedies for wrongful death, personal injury, property damage or defamation. Thus, their legal analysis is clearly distinguishable. We are not, however, without guidance in this matter. Approximately twenty states have now considered the constitutionality of no-action statutes materially similar to our own. For decisions holding such statutes to be unconstitutional see *McClanahan* v. *American Gilsonite Co.*, 494 F. Supp. 1334 (D. Colo., 1980); *Fujioka* v. *Kann*, 514 P.2d 568 (Hawaii 1973); *Skinner* v. *Anderson*, 231 N.E.2d 588 (Ill. 1967); *Pacific Indem. Co.* v. *Thompson-Yaeger, Inc.*, 260 N.W.2d 548 (Minn. 1977); *Loyal Order of the Moose Lodge 1785* v. *Cavaness*, 563 P.2d 143 (Okla. 1977); *Broome* v. *Truluck*, 241 S.E.2d 739 (S.C. 1978); *Kallas Millwork Corp.* v. *Square D. Co.*, 225 N.W.2d

---

[1]The numerous arguments raised by the appellees concerning preservation of the constitutional issue, failure to notify the Attorney General, and standing of the appellant to sue have been reviewed and are considered to be nonpersuasive. They will not be further discussed in this opinion.

454 (Wis. 1975); *Phillips* v. *ABC Builders, Inc.*, 611 P.2d 821 (Who. 1980); *State Farm Fire and Casualty Co.* v. *All Electric, Inc.*, 660 P.2d 995 (Nev. 1953). For decisions holding such statutes to be constitutional see *Carter* v. *Hartenstein*, 455 S.W.2d 918 (Ark. 1970); *Burmaster* v. *Gravity Drainage District No. 2 of Parish of St. Charles*, 366 So.2d 1381 (La. 1978); *Bouser* v. *Lincoln Park*, 268 N.W.2d 332 (Mich. App. 1978); *Reeves* v. *Ille Electric Co.*, 551 P.2d 647 (Mont. 1976); *Rosenberg* v. *North Bergen*, 293 A.2d 662 (N.J. 1972); *Howell* v. *Burk, 568 P.2d 214 (N.M. App. 1977); Joseph* v. *Burns*, 491 P.2d 108 (Ore. 1971); *Hill* v. *Forrest & Cotton, Inc.*, 555 S.W.2d 145 (Tex. Civ. App. 1977); *Good* v. *Christenson*, 527 P.2d 223 (Utah 1974); *Yakima Fruit & Cold Storage Co.* v. *Central Heating & Plumbing Co.*, 503 P.2d 103 (Wash. 1972). While the no-action statutes involved in these decisions may vary from state to state in their language and the length of their time limitations, these variations are for the most part insignificant, "a distinguishing factor of no importance." *Phillips* v. *ABC Builders*, Inc., *supra*, at 825. The two exceptions to the material uniformity among the various statutes are found in the Oregon and Washington statutes which, unlike the Kentucky statute, do not enumerate a class, but instead declare all persons involved in construction of the improvement immune from suit after seven years. *Id. at 380.*

In essence, KRS 413.135 imposes a five year time limit upon actions against architects, engineers, or builders for injury or death arising from any deficiency in their "design, planning, supervision, inspection or construction of any improvement to real property." No legal action may be brought against these individuals more than five years after the substantial completion of the improvement. That their negligence may have been the sole proximate cause of property damage, personal injury, or death is immaterial. They may not be successfully sued in tort or in contract after the five year time period has run. In this sense, KRS 413.135 is a statute of repose and may be said to bar a cause of action before it exists, for persons injured six, seven, or any number of years greater than five years following substantial completion of the improvement forfeit their potential cause of action before it accrues, before they are injured. *See Kallas Millwork Corp.* v. *Square D. Co., supra,* at 457. In contrast, the traditional statute of limitations normally begins to run upon the plaintiff's discovery of his injury and is intended as a means of ensuring that plaintiffs diligently pursue their rights. Under KRS 413.135 discovery or even the existence of injury is unimportant and diligent prosecution of an untimely action is futile.

The origin of KRS 413.135 and other such statutes of repose can be found as the indirect result of the landmark decision *MacPherson* v. *Buick Motor*

Co., 111 N.E. 1050 (N.Y. 1916). Prior to *MacPherson, supra*, the doctrine of "privity of contract" established in the mid-1800's by *Winterbottom* v. *Wright*, 10 M. & W. 109 (Eng. 1842) denied third-party plaintiffs recovery against an architect or engineer responsible for design or construction of a defective structure once that structure had been completed and accepted by the owner *MacPherson, supra*, and its progeny, however, abolished the defense of "no privity of contract," thus exposing the presently involved professionals to potential interminable liability. *See Limitation of Action Statutes for Architects and Builders - -Blueprints for Non-Action*, 18 Cath. U.L. Rev. 361 (1969); *Recent Statutory Developments Concerning the Limitations of Actions Against Architects, Engineers and Builders*, 60 K.L.J. 462 (1971-72); Annot 93 A.L.R.3rd 1249 (1979). Their reaction to this expanded responsibility was to use their separate professional organizations to lobby for model legislation such as KRS 413.135. By 1969, over thirty states had adopted such statutes. *See Loyal Order of Moose Lodge 1785* v. *Cavaness, supra*, at 145. However, following the initial legislative surge to enact no-action statutes during the 1960's, they became increasingly subject to constitutional attack on three bases: (1) that they abrogate a common law right, (2) that they are special legislation, (3) that they violate the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution. At present, we are concerned solely with the complexities of the equal

protection provisions of the Kentucky and United States Constitution.

Equal protection of the law is a constitutional guarantee which does not readily lend itself to patent formuli. Its parameters are instead, best developed on a case-by-case basis within the confines of facts giving rise to actual controversies. Numerous courts, however, have attempted to set forth a basic understanding of the standards involved. In *Fujioka* v. *Kann*, *supra*, an early decision declaring the architect's no-action statute of Hawaii unconstitutional, it is stated that " 'What is prohibited by the equal protection guaranty is class legislation, discriminating against some and favoring others:" *Id.* at 570 (citing *State* v. *Johnston*, 456 P.2d 805, 810 (Hawaii 1969).) *Fujioka* continues to add that " 'in exercising this right to classify in order to achieve social goals the legislature may not act arbitrarily; that is, the classification of a particular group as a subject for regulation must be reasonable in relation to the purpose of the legislation,' " *Id.* at 571 (citing *Hasegawa* v. *Maui Pineapple Co.*, 475 P.2d 679, 681 (Hawaii 1970)). The test to find a statute invalid under the equal protection clause has also been expressed in *Kallas Millwork Corporation* v. *Square D. Co.*, *supra*, a Wisconsin decision holding that state's no-action statute unconstitutional, as being "whether there exists any rational and reasonable justification for the classification." *Id.* at 458 (citing *State* v. *Duffy*, 194 N.W.2d 624 (Wisc. 1972)). *Kallas* continues to add

that "[o]nly if the classification is arbitrary and has no reasonable purpose or reflects no justifiable public policy will the classification be held violative of constitutional guarantees of equal protection." *Id.* (citing *Simanco, Inc.*, v. *Dep't of Revenue*, 203 N.W.2d 648, (Wisc. 1973)). Kentucky's highest appellate court, has described the guarantee thusly, "there must be a substantial reason why a particular law is made to operate upon a class of citizens and not generally upon all.'" *Walters* v. *Binder*, Ky., 435 S.W.2d 464, 466 (1968) (citing *Dawson* v. *Hamilton*, Ky., 314 S.W.2d 532 (1968)). Put otherwise, " 'For a law to be general in its constitutional sense it must meet the following requirements: (1) It must apply equally to all in a class, and (2) there must be distinctive and natural reasons inducing and supporting the classification.'" *Id.* (citing *Schoo* v. *Rose*, Ky., 270 S.W.2d 940 (1954)). It is the second of the two criteria upon which we focus our attention. Specifically, we ask whether the classification created by KRS 413.135 is rational in fact. In layman's terms, are there any real differences to distinguish the favored class, architects, engineers, and builders, from other classes excluded from the statute's protection, in this case, persons in control of the real property and tenants (specifically excluded under subsection 4 of KRS 413.135) and materialmen (recently excluded from protection by the Kentucky Supreme Court Decision *In re: Beverly Hills Fire litigation*, Ky., S.W.2d_____, 31 K.L.S. 7 (May 31, 1984). After a thorough review of the cases on both

sides of the issue we conclude that there is no rational basis to exclude materialmen, and controlling owners and tenants from the immunity granted architects, engineers, and builders by KRS 413.135.

Of the many cases upholding statutes such as KRS 413.135, few vigorously analyze the reasons potentially supporting the class distinctions created. Most of these opinions seem content simply to recognize the general power of the legislature to classify while repeating general prescriptions for analyzing the guarantees of equal protection *See Kallas Millwork Corp.* v. *Square D. Co., supra,* at 460 (criticizing *Rosenberg* v. *Town of North Bergen, supra;* and *Yakima Fruit & Cold Storage Co.* v. *Central Heating & Plumbing Co., supra;* for their failure to come to grips with the real problem presented); *Pacific Indemnity Company* v. *Thompson-Yaeger, Inc., supra,* at 555 ("We have reviewed these cases carefully are are convinced that the better reasoned position is embodied in the decisions which hold such statutes to be unconstitutional. . . ."); *Phillips* v. *ABC Builders, Inc., supra,* at 830 (condemning *Carter* v. *Hartenstein, supra; Reeves* v. *Ille Electric Co., supra;* and *Burmaster* v. *Gravity Drainage District No. 2 of Parish of St. Charles, supra;* as being conclusory). Of the remaining cases more completely examing the issue, the most thorough constitutional defense of this type of statute is found in *Freezer Storage, Inc.* v. *Armstrong Cork Co.,* 341 A.2d 184 (Pa. Supr. Ct. 1975). In that decision, the Pennsylvania court advanced the follow-

ing rationale to distinguish between materialmen and architects, engineers and contractors.

> . . .[T]he distinction drawn between the two classes is rational. Suppliers who typically produce items by the thousands can easily maintain high quality control standards in the controlled environment of the factory. A builder on the other hand, can pre-test his designs and construction only in limited ways - actual use in the years following construction is the only real test. Further, every building is unique and far more complex than its component parts.
>
> ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★
>
> The legislature can rationally conclude that the conditions under which builders work are sufficiently difficult that limitations should be placed on their liabilities but not on the liabilities of suppliers.

Id. at 719.

We cannot accept this conclusion. The high quality of control in the factory ends at the factory gates. Once a material supplier's goods are taken to the site and incorporated into the structure, the supplier is at the mercy of those who construct, maintain and control the property. Suppliers assume the exact risks of the protected class yet receive no protection under KRS 413.135. *See Phillips* v. *ABC Builders, Inc., supra,* at 830. It is the identical nature of the risk that

the separate, but similarly situated, groups are exposed to and not the conditions under which they work that is controlling. Architects, engineers, and contractors all are licensed professionals who undergo extensive technical training solely for the purpose of dealing with the unique nature of the structures they design and construct. We fail to see any rational basis for distinguishing them from suppliers or materialmen whose products, while uniform, are incorporated into unique structures, thus becoming uniquely used and placed under the control of third party owners and tenants. For further criticism of *Freezer Storage, supra, See Loyal Order of Moose Lodge 1785, supra,* at 147.

We do not stand alone in this conclusion. The absence of any rational distinction between the above groups has often been noted. In *Skinner* v. *Anderson, supra,* at 591, the court in a frequently quoted passage states that,

> The arbitrary quality of the statute clearly appears when we consider that architects and contractors are not the only persons whose negligence in the construction of a building or other improvement may cause damage to property or injury to persons. If, for example, four years after a building is completed a cornice should fall because the adhesive used was defective, the manufacturer of the adhesive is granted no immunity. And so it is with all others who furnish materials used in constructing the improvement.

> But if construction for which an architect or contractor was responsible, immunity is granted. It can not be said that the one event is more likely than the other to occur within four years after construction is completed.

We believe this reasoning to be sound. We join in this view and now reverse.

The judgment of the Fayette Circuit Court is reversed and this cause is remanded for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

HAYES, CHIEF JUDGE, CONCURS.

HOWARD, JUDGE, DISSENTS.

HOWARD, JUDGE, DISSENTING: I respectfully dissent from the majority opinion because the "equal protection of the laws" argument was not preserved for review. This issue was never raised before the trial court, and under well-considered and long-standing precedents, it cannot be considered for the first time on appeal. *Pittsburg and Midway Coal Mining Co.* v. *Rushing*, Ky., 456 S.W.2d 816 (1969); *Akers* v. *Floyd County Fiscal Court*, Ky., 556 S.W.2d 146 (1977). Therefore, I would affirm the judgment of the trial court.

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT:

Peter Perlman
PERLMAN & GARMER, P.S.C.
388 South Broadway
Lexington, Kentucky 40508

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLEES:

David L. Armstrong
Attorney General
Capitol Building
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Calvin R. Fulkerson
Ronald Green
W. T. Adkins
710 First National Building
Lexington, Kentucky 40507

Robert H. Measle
Suite Four-A
Citizens Bank Square
Lexington, Kentucky 40507

James Carroll
109 Short Street
Harrodsburg, Kentucky 40330

APPENDIX E

JUNE 30 1983

FAYETTE CIRCUIT COURT
CIVIL BRANCH
FIRST DIVISION

MARY L. WALLACE, Administratrix
of the Estate of WILLIAM WALLACE,
and MARY L. WALLACE, Individually PLAINTIFFS

VS: NO. 81-CI-1066

SUMMARY JUDGMENT

HARLEY HOTELS, INC., RUSSELL
HALCOMB, WILLIAM B. TABLER
ARCHITECT, and DOVER ELEVATOR
COMPANY DEFENDANTS

* * * * * *

This Cause coming on to be heard upon Motion of the Defendants, WILLIAM B. TABLER, Architect, and DOVER ELEVATOR COMPANY, for a Summary Judgment in their favor on all claims of the Plaintiff, MARY L. WALLACE, Administratrix of the Estate of WILLIAM WALLACE, and MARY L. WALLACE, Individually, as asserted against said Defendants; arguments of counsel having been heard; Memoranda of Law submitted by the parties having been considered by the Court; the Court having entered its Opinion in this matter on June 22, 1983, sustaining said Motion for Summary Judgment on behalf of both of the above

named Defendants, which said Opinion is incorporated herewith and made a part of this Judgment; and the Court being sufficiently advised;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the Complaint of the Plaintiff, MARY L. WALLACE, Administratrix of the Estate of WILLIAM WALLACE, and MARY L. WALLACE, Individually, be dismissed with prejudice as against said Defendants, WILLIAM B. TABLER, Architect, and DOVER ELEVATOR COMPANY, and that the Plaintiff take nothing thereby;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that said Defendants recover of the Plaintiff their costs herein expended.

THE COURT FURTHER ORDERS AND ADJUDGES that there is no just reason or cause for delay, and that this is a Final and Appealable Judgment.

/s/ James H. Keller
JUDGE, FAYETTE CIRCUIT COURT

A True Copy
ATTEST
FAYETTE CIRCUIT COURT
/s/ S. Oden Deputy
Dated: 6-30-83

PREPARED BY:

FOWLER, MEASLE & BELL
By: /s/ Robert H. Measle
ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT,
DOVER ELEVATOR COMPANY

It is hereby certified that true copies of the foregoing Summary Judgment have been served by mail upon the following attorneys of record for the parties herein, this the 30 day of June, 1983:

William R. Garmer, Esq.
PERLMAN & GARMER, P.S.C.
ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS

James S. Carroll, Esq.
ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANTS,
HARLEY HOTELS, INC. and
RUSSELL HALCOMB

* * * * * * *

APPENDIX F

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
COURT OF APPEALS
FILE NO. 83-CA-2160-MR

MARY L. WALLACE, Administratrix
of the Estate of WILLIAM WALLACE,
and MARY L. WALLACE,
Individually PLAINTIFF/APPELLANT

VS:

WILLIAM B. TABLER, Architect,
and DOVER ELEVATOR
COMPANY DEFENDANTS/APPELLEES

AND

HARLEY HOTELS, INC., and
RUSSELL HALCOMB DEFENDANTS

NOTICE OF INTENT NOT TO INTERVENE

Comes now the Commonwealth of Kentucky, by counsel, and hereby acknowledges receipt of the Notice of Appeal and the Brief in the above-styled action, and further informs this Court and the parties hereto that the Attorney General does not intend to intervene.

peal was entered in this Court and a true copy thereof was mailed to the following:

Hon. James S. Carroll
Mercer Federal Annex
109 Short Street
Harrodsburg, Kentucky 40330

Hon. Calvin R. Fulkerson
710 First National Building
Lexington, Kentucky 40507

Hon. Robert H. Measle
Suite Four A
Citizens Bank Square
Lexington, Kentucky 40507-1680

Hon. James E. Keller
Judge Fayette Circuit Court
First Division
Fayette County Courthouse

Hon. John C. Scott, Clerk
Court of Appeals of Kentucky
Bush Building
403 Wapping Street
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

on this 15th day of July, 1983.

/s/Robert M. True by Warren Smith
ROBERT M. TRUE, CLERK
FAYETTE CIRCUIT COURT

trial court's final and appealable Order and Judgment granting the Defendants, William B. Tabler, Architect, and Dover Elevator Company's Motion for Summary Judgment entered by this court on June 30, 1983.

The names of the appellees in the action are: Defendant-Appellee, William B. Tabler, Architect, and, Defendant-Appellee, Dover Elevator Company.

PERLMAN & GARMER, P.S.C.
388 SOUTH BROADWAY
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
40508

A TRUE COPY
ATTEST: ROBERT M. TRUE, CLERK
FAYETTE CIRCUIT COURT
BY: Paula Smith Deputy

BY:/s/ Peter Perlman
PETER PERLMAN

NOTICE OF ENTRY
AND CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

I, Robert M. True, Clerk of the Fayette Circuit Court, hereby certify that the foregoing Notice of Ap-

APPENDIX G

CONSTITUTIONAL, STATUTORY, AND PROCEDURAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED

U.S. CONSTITUTION, FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT:

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

KENTUCKY RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

CR 24.03

A person desiring to intervene shall serve a motion to intervene upon the parties as provided in Rule 5. The motion shall state the grounds therefor and shall be accompanied by a pleading setting forth the claim or defense for which intervention is sought. The same procedure shall be followed when a statute gives a right to intervene. When the constitutionality of an act of the General Assembly affecting the public interest is drawn in question in any action to which the State or an officer, agency, or employe thereof is not a

party, the movant shall serve notice of the motion upon the Attorney-General.

CR 46

Formal exceptions to rulings or orders of the court are unnecessary; but for all purposes for which an exception has heretofore been necessary it is sufficient that a party, at the time the ruling or order of the court is made or sought, makes known to the court the action which he desires the court to take or his objection to the action of the court, and on request of the court, his grounds therefor; and, if a party has no opportunity to object to a ruling or order at the time it is made, the absence of an objection does not thereafter prejudice him.

KENTUCKY STATUTES

KRS 418.070

Necessary parties - Notice to attorney general. -When declaratory relief is sought, all persons shall be made parties who have or claim any interest which would be affected by the declaration, and no declaration shall prejudice the rights of persons not parties to the proceeding. In any proceeding which involves the validity of a statute, the attorney general of the state shall, before judgment is entered, be served with a copy of the petition, and shall be entitled to be heard, and if the ordinance or franchise is alleged to be unconstitutional, the attorney general of the state shall also be served with a copy of the petition and be entitled to be heard.